



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,764	06/23/2003	Eddy Lambert	016782-0280	5710
22428	7590	09/04/2007		EXAMINER
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			COLE, ELIZABETH M	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3000 K STREET NW				1771
WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/600,764	Applicant(s) LAMBERT ET AL.
	Examiner Elizabeth M. Cole	Art Unit 1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-31,33-35,38-46,51-55 and 57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-31, 33-35, 38-46, 51-55, 57 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1771

1. Claims 13-31, 33-35, 38-46, 51-55, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification as originally filed does not provide support for the limitation that the stainless steel fibers are made from a high temperature alloy. The specification as originally filed teaches "heat resistant stainless steel fibers" and teaches that "Fecralloy" is a suitable variety of heat resistant stainless steel fibers, but the specification does not recite that the stainless steel fibers are made from a high temperature alloy. Applicant has provided information in the form of material data sheets describing the composition of Fecralloy. The specification needs to be amended to include these limitations. Further, such amendments must be supported by satisfactory showings establishing that the specific nature or process of manufacture of the product as set forth in the amendment was known at the time of filing of the application. Therefore, Applicant needs to provide a showing that the trademark Fecralloy at the time the application was filed has the meaning and composition shown in the attached information. The showing in the appendix does not appear to have a date showing that the composition at the time the application was filed the same as the composition at the time the material data sheet was obtained.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13-31, 33-34, 38-46, 51-55, 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowaegheneire et al, WO 97/04152, in view of Hunter et al, U.S. Patent NO. 4,214,867, EP 0268146 and Krupnik et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,298,538. Dowaegheneire discloses a burner fabric comprising machined metal filaments which may comprise a high temperature alloy, such as alloys of iron, chromium and yttrium. See page 3, lines 20-32. The fibers can be formed into fabrics which are used as burner membranes. See page 4, lines 20-36.. The fabrics are useful as burner membranes without having to be sintered and have an advantage over sintered membranes because the unsintered membranes are more pliable and because they heat up much more rapidly. See page 6, line 31 – page 7, line 16. The fibers are made by shaving, (see page 1, lines 8-17; page 5, lines 7-10. Dowaegheneire differs from the claimed invention because it does not teach employing nonwoven fabrics but instead teaches knitted fabrics, does not teach needling. Hunter et al teaches that both knitted and nonwoven fabrics can be used to make burner membranes. See col. 2, lines 51-52. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed a nonwoven rather than knitted fabric in the invention of Dowaegheneire, motivated by the teaching of Hunter that both types of fabrics were recognized in the art as being suitable for use as burner membranes. With regard to the needling, Krupnik teaches that needling nonwoven webs formed from

metal fibers such as stainless steel fibers produces a stronger product. See abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have needled the web of Dowaegheneire, in order to produce a stronger fabric. With regard to the particular porosity claimed, since needling is known in the art as a method by which the density and porosity of a nonwoven can be adjusted and controlled, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the degree of needling through the process of routine experimentation in order to arrive at a fabric having the desired porosity.

4. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over . Dowaegheneire et al, WO 97/04152, in view of Hunter et al, U.S. Patent NO. 4,214,867 and Krupnik et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,298,538 as applied to claims above, and further in view of DeBruyne et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,088,919. Dowaegheneire does not disclose coating the fibers with a coating that activates the oxidation of the burner fuel mixture. De Bruyne et al teaches that the fibers can be coated with a material which activates the oxidation of the burner fuel mixture. See col. 4, lines 35-49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have coated the fibers of Dowaegheneire with the coating of De Bruyne et al, motivated by the expectation that this would enhance the heat resistance of the fibers.
5. Applicant's arguments filed 6/19/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the prior art cited in the instant response shows that the trademark term Fecralloy was known to be an alloy comprising iron, chromium and

Art Unit: 1771

yttrium. However, a internet search produced results that there are a number of materials which use the trademark Fecralloy, some of which comprise yttrium and some of which do not. Therefore, the rejection is maintained because it is not clear what the trademarked term is intended to designate, either a composition which comprises yttrium or one which does not, or both.

6. With regard to the new art rejection above, newly cited reference WO 97/04152, Dowaegheneire, teaches fabrics formed from Fecralloy fibers and other high temperature alloys which are used to make burner membranes and which are not sintered. Dowaegheneire teaches that non sintering the membrane produces a more pliable membrane which heats up more quickly. Therefore, in view of this teaching, the previously indicated allowability of the claims for reciting that the burner membrane was not sintered and comprised high temperature alloy fibers is withdrawn.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

Mr. Terrel Morris, the examiner's supervisor, may be reached at (571) 272-1478.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (571) 273-8300.

/Elizabeth M. Cole/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771

Application/Control Number: 10/600,764

Art Unit: 1771

Page 6